

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**JAYSON E. H.<sup>1</sup>,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION,**

Defendant.

Case No. 6:17-cv-1844-JE

**ORDER**

**Michael H. Simon, District Judge.**

United States Magistrate Judge John Jelderks issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on August 28, 2019. ECF 17. Magistrate Judge Jelderks recommended that the Commissioner’s denial of Plaintiff’s application for Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) under the Social Security Act should be reversed and remanded to the Social Security Administration (“the Agency”) for further proceedings. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

---

<sup>1</sup> In the interest of privacy, this order uses only the first name and the initial of the last name of the non-governmental party or parties in this case.

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Jelderks’ Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Jelderks’ Findings and Recommendation, ECF 17. The Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED** and this action is **REMANDED** to the Agency for further proceedings consistent with Judge Jelderks’ findings.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 20th day of September, 2019.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge